

**Remarks:**

Entry of the above-listed amendments is respectfully requested. These amendments were made in response to the examiner's remarks in the office action of December 19, 2005, and also in response to a discussions with the examiner in a telephone conference in a related case. No new matter has been added, and the amendments having new language is fully supported in the application as filed.

**Status of the Claims:**

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for not complying with the written description requirement.

Claims 1, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 2, 6-12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,317,729, "Mukherjee."

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Mukherjee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,317,729, "Thorsen."

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Mukherjee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,791, "Koko."

Claims 1-9 and 11-16 have been amended. Claim 10 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added to the amended claims.

## Arguments

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for not complying with the written description requirement. In particular, the examiner points to several occurrences of the language “a version of an object” and “a version of the object”, and that the use of these phrases in connection with access privileges or access criteria. In response, the claims have been amended to clarify the proper usage of the versions of the objects, thus obviating the rejection.

Claims 1, 14 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In particular, Claim 1 stands rejected for the use of the phrases “a system for providing the transfer of and the controlled access... and other associated information a file”. The claim is further rejected for unclearly referencing versions of objects “that was set up to be sent” and “that may be viewed”... In response, Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this language, thus obviating the rejection.

Also, Claim 14 stands rejected for reciting “the object stored in the file” as “a version of the object stored in the file” without antecedent basis. Claim 14 has been amended to clarify this language. Also, Claim 14 was rejected for improper grammar in the phrase “receiving a object request”, and it has been amended to read “receiving an object request”, having proper grammar, thus obviating the rejection.

Finally, Claim 16 similarly stands rejected for including phrases with improper grammar. Claim 16 has been amended with proper grammar to clarify the invention, thus obviating the rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 6-12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,317,729, “Mukherjee.” Mukerherjee does not disclose or suggest, however, the creation and transmission of “redacted” version s of objects, documents or related files, and all of the

Amended claims have one or more of these limitations to redacted objects. Thus, the rejection is obviated by the appended amended claims.

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Mukherjee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,317,729, "Thorsen." Neither Mukherjee nor Thorsen, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose the ability to create or transmit "redacted" versions of objects, documents or related files, and all of the amended claims, including Claims 13-15, include this limitation, thus obviating the rejection.

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Mukherjee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,434,791, "Koko." Neither Mukherjee nor Koko, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose the ability to create or transmit "redacted" versions of objects, documents or related files, and all of the amended claims, including Claims 3-5, include this limitation, thus obviating the rejection.

Finally, applicant would like to draw the examiner's attention to co-pending application serial no. 10/660,296, filed on September 10, 2003. Applicant has included herein a terminal disclaimer to disclaim all rights that may result from the present application beyond any time that may be acquired by this co-pending application. Thus, any potential double patenting issues are obviated by this terminal disclaimer.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw all pending rejections, and to allow the newly amended claims. If the examiner finds that there is any further impediment to allowing the pending claims, he is invited to phone the undersigned to resolve any such impediments.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2421.

If there are any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact the undersigned at (408) 288-7588.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 19, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David R. Stevens", is written over a solid horizontal line.

David R. Stevens  
Reg. No. 38,626

Stevens Law Group  
P.O. Box 1667  
San Jose, CA 95109  
Tel (408) 288-7588  
Fax (408) 288-7542